

Claim 1 is directed to a dynamic vibration absorber comprising a plurality of vertically mounted U-shaped leaf springs which are interposed between the frame body and the weight so as to hold the weight with respect to the frame body movably with respect to all directions in a plane and immovably in a vertical direction perpendicular to the plane.

The combination of Aida et al. and Besson et al. does not teach or suggest this subject matter. In particular, Aida et al. discloses a dynamic vibration absorber in which the weight portion 1 is supported by the receptacles 9 and the corresponding bearings 8 to maintain the gap 7 to a fixed value. However, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Aida et al. does not disclose or suggest the recited U-shaped leaf springs for holding the weight portion 1 with respect to the upper and lower plates 4 and 5 movably with respect to all directions in a plane and immovably in a vertical direction perpendicular to the plane.

To make up for this deficiency, the Office Action apparently relies on the teachings of Besson et al. Besson et al. teaches a device for supporting a piezoelectric resonator inside a casing 10, in which 8 springs 5 ensure the suspension of half-shells 2, 3 with respect to the casing. However, Besson et al. does not disclose or suggest the application of the 8 springs 5 to the dynamic vibration absorber for holding the weight with respect to the frame body movably with respect to all directions in a plane and immovably in a vertical direction perpendicular to the plane.

Accordingly, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the supporting system of Aida et al. (including receptacles 9 and corresponding bearings 8) with the 8 springs 5 of Besson et al. in order to provide a means of creating a damping force which acts on the weight.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

SHIMODA et al.
Appl. No. 10/563,446
August 21, 2008

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Aida et al. in view of Besson et al., and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0134733 (Wood). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the reason that claims 9-13 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable by virtue of that dependency, and for the further features they recite.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are patentable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Account No. 14-1140 under Order No. PTB-1207-131.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, she is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Paul T. Bowen/
Paul T. Bowen
Reg. No. 38,009

PTB:jck
Attachment: Copy of Form PTO/SB/08a

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100